



MOTORSPORTS TASK FORCE

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2007

COUNTY-CITY BUILDING

555 S. 10TH STREET, ROOM 113

7:30 A.M. - 8:30 A.M.

1. Approval of Minutes - February 21, 2007
2. Proposed Survey
3. Draft Final Report

MINUTES
MOTORSPORTS TASK FORCE
Wednesday, February 28, 2007 - 7:30 a.m.
County-City Building, Room 113

Task Force Members Present: Russ Bayer, Chair; Carol Brown, Dave Dykmann, Gary Juilfs, Chris Kingery, Karen Kurbis, Mike Tavlin, Greg Osborn, Stan Patzel, Larry Lewis, Mike DeKalb, Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department (Ex-officio); Kerry Eagan, County Chief Administrative Officer (Ex-officio); Darl Naumann, Lincoln-Lancaster County Economic Development Coordinator (Ex-officio), Jeff Maul, Convention & Visitors Bureau Executive Director (Ex-officio) and Scott Holmes, Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department (Ex-officio)

Task Force Member Absent: Randy Harre

Others Present: Marvin Krout, Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department; Marlene Tracy, Jeff Atkinson, J.R. Brown, Randy Moore, Jim McNeil, Jill Bailie, The Waverly News; Jean Ortiz, Lincoln Journal Star; Cori Beattie, County Board Secretary; and other interested parties

Minutes

Bayer solicited changes to the minutes from the meeting on February 21, 2007. With regard to the email from Rod Wolter addressing land prices, Kurbis asked the record to reflect that it referred to NASCAR facilities. She added eminent domain was the reason why some of the land was acquired so cheaply. Also, the numbers from Eagle Raceway did not total. She came up 377 total homes within four miles of the track instead of 585.

Tavlin moved approval of the minutes; seconded by Lewis. Motion passed unanimously.

Final Draft Report

Copies of the draft report were distributed. **(See Exhibit A.)** Bayer said Eagan will go through the document with discussion following. Public comment will also be allowed at the end.

Eagan said it was difficult to come up with findings and conclusions as the Task Force had not made any to date. Regarding the process, he said the plans to visit the Topeka track could be included or simply mentioned verbally to the County Board.

With regard to the acres needed, he said the number used was one provided by Rod Wolter. The total amount may be less or more and suggested possibly a range be included. While only three location criteria were included in the draft and based off the subcommittee's report, Eagan pointed out others could be listed.

Under economic impact, Eagan questioned whether the Task Force wanted to note that the report generated by Dr. Eric Thompson was commissioned by the Nebraska Motorplex (Greg Sanford).

In reference to environmental and social impacts, Eagan said the detail is going to be in the subcommittee's report. He noted in the report that other impacts need additional study, as does the effect on surrounding property values.

Eagan said it is nationally known that motorsports is probably the most popular spectator sport. On the local level, there has been a lot of participation at public hearings and the County Board received much correspondence indicating a strong, local interest.

Finally, Eagan said the proposed recommendations were simply intended as a starting point for discussion. Bayer suggested going back through the draft report section-by-section with members offering comments. With regard to format, he also suggested listing specific subcommittee recommendations followed by overall recommendations.

Introduction/Task Force Members

No changes were noted.

Task Force Process

In response to Eagan's inquiry, members agreed the presentations from Dr. Dominique Chéenne and Dr. Eric Thompson be attached along with subcommittee reports. Maul added any materials used to get to this point should be included. Bayer said a list of attachments could be inserted.

Location

Bayer said it would be his preference to have a map with locations identified but not ranked. Another option would be to allow each voting Task Force member to come up with three choices and prioritize them as a group. Lewis said he would like to include the original colored subcommittee map.

Patzel felt such factors as the cost of infrastructure and whether or not the land identified as a potential site is even available for purchase should be noted. Brown said all sites should be treated equally versus locking in a ranked site which may prove to be unviable. Kurbis added there are reasons (infrastructure, noise, etc.) why certain sites have more critical issues. Without rankings, it is harder to know the more important variables. Patzel said these answers are unknown. Kingery added all the possibilities should be provided as the County Board will take final action.

DeKalb said there are a number of unknowns which probably should be part of the recommendation as intended for further study. He reiterated the charge from the County Board was to attempt to identify and rank the most promising and acceptable locations. He felt the subcommittee did an excellent job, with the limited resources available. He suggested forwarding one of three maps: (1) unranked, generalized areas of opportunity; (2) original subcommittee opportunities map; or (3) locations prioritized numerically by entire Task Force. Juilfs said he supported the original subcommittee map. However, if the decision is to go with a generic map, a clear list of criteria should be included so the Board can apply them to all locations. Eagan noted the subcommittee report could be cited as it includes more detailed information.

Tavlin supported the submittal of the original subcommittee map but stressed the unknown factors be included. Osborn agreed, although, he was not excited about the colored areas but understood the Board asked for rankings. Additionally, he felt the Board should know the importance of the criteria used and not used in arriving at the rankings. Dykmann clarified that the sites the subcommittee ranked are those found to be acceptable per the criteria listed. Brown agreed all subcommittee caveats should be attached to the report.

Bayer suggested a vote on which map to include in the final report. It was decided by a vote of 8-0 to forward the original subcommittee map with criteria. (Brown and Patzel abstained.)

With regard to final report language, Eagan said a separate bullet will identify the map and include a brief discussion on how it was developed. The location subcommittee report will also be referenced. Bayer suggested another section listing factors not taken into consideration - infrastructure, flooding, availability, etc. Eagan added he could include a cautionary phrase noting assumptions were made but due to limited resources, there were questions which the subcommittee could not answer. Bayer said to include a couple examples. Osborn said time was also a factor.

Bayer said if there is a subcategory, a locations recommendation could be that each site identified on the map be studied for feasibility, viability, availability, etc.

With regard to location near the Interstate, Osborn asked the report reflect the facility be off I-80 far enough to control traffic. Eagan said exit location is the most important. After further discussion the following language was suggested, "...close access to major paved road preferably along I-80, with adequate traffic controls as not to impede traffic."

In reference to the bullet point, "Locate near existing noise sources to mask track noise", Brown said she acquired traffic counts from the Department of Roads for I-80 and N. Highway 77. She questioned how much is enough traffic to mask sound from a facility. Bayer indicated he was comfortable with the general statement as written. Kingery added in his experience, no amount of interstate traffic will block this kind of noise.

Osborn said he is not comfortable with the way this point is stated as location near other sources is not the only thing which would affect noise. Juilfs suggested changing the word "mask" to mitigate. Instead of listing only one item, Osborn thought the report could reference attached documentation regarding other criteria. Dykmann pointed out Dr. Chéenne stated inversion (weather) is going to make the biggest difference. Bayer suggested the following wording, "The most important criteria in locating a facility include: access, noise considerations and residential considerations." Eagan said "residential" could be replaced with "compatibility with surrounding land uses." Brown asked that the word residential be retained as land uses change all the time. Kurbis felt residential should be removed. Eagan suggested, "Low impact on residential areas and compatible with other uses."

With regard to the first bullet under location, Maul suggested, "...facility that can accommodate a multiple use motorsports facility." In summary, Bayer said under this bullet, it could be added that a stand alone drag strip also requires one mile in length. Additionally, generic criteria is to be included referring to the subcommittee report. The subcommittee map will also be attached.

Juilfs noted if a facility is constructed near existing infrastructure, there will be a bigger economic impact to the community than having a stand alone facility with its own infrastructure. He thought it should be noted in the report that there is preference in locating a facility near current services. Brown felt this assumption cannot be made. Osborn said this responsibility could be left to the developer. DeKalb added the presentation from Rod Wolter indicated a facility should be within 3-5 miles of hotels, restaurants, etc. He said Dr. Thompson also pointed out the closer the facility, the more economic impact. He suggested a comment like, "the closer, the better", be included somewhere in the report.

Economic Impact

Bayer asked if it should be referenced that Dr. Thompson's report was commissioned by Nebraska Motorplex. Eagan suggested a small footnote to this effect.

With respect to the third sub-bullet, Tavlin stated public funding does not create a negative economic impact, though, it may reduce the overall economic impact. It was agreed the wording

be changed to, "Public funding for development and operation of a facility may reduce the overall economic impact."

It was noted a fourth sub-bullet could be "...a facility located within five miles of existing services could have a greater positive economic impact than one more remotely located."

With regard to the second bullet, Osborn would like the wording to be more positive. The following wording was suggested, "Additional positive secondary economic impacts are likely." Maul also noted it should be taken into consideration that Dr. Thompson's study was only geared toward drag racing. Eagan suggested, "The multiplier effect of tourism dollars is likely to create an additional positive secondary economic impact."

It was suggested the first sub-bullet include, "...annual impact of an NHRA or national sanctioned drag racing facility in Lancaster County...". Bayer said, again, the subcommittee report will also be referenced.

In reference to property values, Brown said she found assessment information on a few properties near tracks - one in Cass County, NE, and one in Wichita, KS - which show a positive effect. Bayer said the subcommittee report does not indicate either way. He asked Brown if she wanted this information to be submitted to the subcommittee for inclusion with their report. Brown indicated yes as she has heard a facility would lower property values but has not seen any supporting evidence. The wording for the second bullet under Economic Impact was approved as written.

Environmental and Social Impacts

With regard to the third sub-bullet, Bayer recommended using the word "variance" instead of "waive." Holmes suggested, "Noise standards need to be established with allowances to exceed the standards for certain events." Bayer said the subcommittee's report will also be referenced.

Under the first sub-bullet, Kingery suggested the following change in an attempt to make things clearer, "Noise testing using simulated sound should be done...". Brown said according to Dr. Chéenne's criteria, a map could be created which shows the levels of sound and impact around the area. She distributed a map and related information which she compiled regarding sound levels and distances. **(See Exhibit B.)** Holmes noted this chart starts at 100 dB and is on a flat surface. It is also for a specific site (Highway 77 & Davey Road) which has had no noise assessment performed. He cautioned the group about considering this information. It was noted the 100 db level would be for muffled cars - unmuffled would be 115 dB.

Bayer thanked Brown for her efforts and felt it also appropriate that cautions be brought up. He added this information basically reflects Dr. Chéenne's comments about the sound at the center decreasing dramatically the farther away. There are also many other circumstances which impact sound such as berms, buildings, inversion (weather), etc. It was pointed out that grass and trees would not help mitigate the low, rumbling noise created by drag racing. Many agreed since Dr. Chéenne's report will be included with the report, there was no reason to include Brown's.

Bayer asked Holmes his feelings on the amended bullets. Holmes indicated he is fine with the bullets, though, would prefer to not use the word "serious" in the first one but rather "important" or "significant." Bayer read the change as, "...poses a significant issue for compatibility with surrounding land uses."

Brown requested the word "noise" be changed to "sound" throughout the report as it has a negative connotation. No support was voiced for that change.

Holmes thought the word "dampen" in the second sub-bullet could be replaced and suggested, "Existing environmental noises can help mitigate motorsports noises."

(Tavlin exited the meeting.)

Demand

A copy of the revised survey was distributed. **(See Exhibit C.)** Naumann said the survey was originally intended to gauge spectators and users. The County Board needed to address some cost issues which arose as they wanted to assure measures were in place to prevent multiple submissions by the same person. During this time, the Board made some changes and Bayer felt the Task Force needed to see them before proceeding. Eagan noted #12, #13 and #14 were added which really were not demand related. Holmes felt the survey does not serve any purpose as the demand is already known. He wondered whether the Task Force should recommend no survey be done or, if the Board wanted to move forward, they should hire professionals. Naumann added he was contacted by several entities who were interested in performing the survey. He estimated the cost to be \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Osborn moved to not do the survey; seconded by Kurbis. Motion passed unanimously. (Tavlin absent.)

Recommendations

Bayer noted recommendations listed in the final report will be broken down by location, impact, demand and general.

With regard to location, Bayer said there was a specific recommendation that all sites be professionally evaluated for feasibility, viability and availability. Eagan thought another recommendation could be for the Board to adopt standards which lay ground rules. Bayer got a sense that experts should be brought in to evaluate sites and bring forth criteria. Patzel added someone should find out which sites are even available for purchase prior to any evaluation.

Eagan said he is having trouble distinguishing private from public sector and asked for clarification on who is supposed to hire experts. He suggested the following wording, "Encourage private investors to investigate these sites." Kingery agreed that the County shouldn't spend the money. Lewis said a realtor should be able to provide availability information at relatively little cost. Kurbis said the option should be given to the developer because if the City and/or County begin checking out those areas, the price of the land is going to increase dramatically. It was noted the list of potential areas has already been publicized.

In reference to the proposed text amendment and specific application currently in front of the County Board, DeKalb felt there should not be a recommendation from the Task Force regarding these items. Osborn agreed. Bayer asked if there should be a recommendation that the Board not move forward with these items until the study is done. Many felt this was outside the scope of the Task Force.

Osborn felt the Board should be encouraged to read all the materials as presented. Bayer said this could be included as a general recommendation.

With regard to impacts, Bayer said two specific recommendations were discussed - one on property valuation and the other on environmental and social impact evaluations.

With regard to demand, Brown said she would rather see the County spend money on site evaluations versus a survey.

Eagan said he felt it important that the City and County work together on this issue that is why he included it under recommendations. Patzel said there should be pressure on officials for this project to move forward. Dykmann encouraged members to contact their County Commissioner.

Under general recommendations, Bayer noted the following will be added as the first bullet, "All materials contained with the report are important and must be reviewed." The bullet regarding Lancaster County and City of Lincoln cooperation will remain. It was noted there are no noise recommendations. Lastly, Bayer suggested the third bullet be moved under the economic impact heading.

Bayer asked if a time frame recommendation should be included under the general heading about whether or not a motorsports facility can be built in Lancaster County. Maul said the call to action is we cannot afford a delay. He noted there is a project waiting very patiently and building this type of facility opens up many other industries to other economic impacts. Kingery thought some of this verbiage should be included in the report. Patzel said the time frame could be for approving the existing location or an alternative. Bayer suggested a final recommendation be, "The Task Force believes the County Board should make a decision by June 1 regarding its acceptance or rejection of motorsports facilities in the County." Osborn felt this was too much time. Lewis said if this project is not done this year, the track will move somewhere else.

By unanimous decision, it was recommended to encourage the Board to decide within 30 days whether or not Lancaster County will have a motoplex. Maul added they should also accept the Task Force's criteria. Eagan suggested the recommendation be for the Board to pass a resolution proclaiming that Lancaster County is a motorsports friendly county and that they will do everything possible to encourage development and operation of a motorsports facility. He added the resolution should incorporate the findings of this Task Force.

Kurbis suggested establishment of a motorsports ordinance. Eagan said it would be good to have one in place so everyone knows the rules. Bayer said this could be included under general recommendations.

Bayer noted there will be another Task Force meeting on Wednesday, March 7 at 7:30 a.m., in Room 113 to discuss the report revisions. Eagan indicated the County Board will discuss the issue on March 13 or 15.

Bayer opened the floor to public comment. Jeff Atkinson thanked the Task Force for their efforts. He felt establishing a motorsports facility in the County is important and noted the demand and the developer are in place.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:37 a.m.


Submitted by,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cori R. Beattie".

Cori Beattie
County Board Secretary

DRAFT

DRAFT



MOTORSPORTS TASK FORCE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS (First Draft February 27, 2007)

INTRODUCTION

The Lancaster County Board of Commissioners established the Motorsports Task Force to assist the Board in addressing the complex issues involved with motorsports facilities. The Task Force was asked to address the following questions:

1. Potential demand for motorsports facilities in Lancaster County
 - a. Examine spectator as well as participant demand
 - b. Review existing facilities in the region
2. Economic, fiscal, social and environmental benefits and costs to the community
 - a. Based on different types of facilities and activity levels
3. Pros and Cons of providing motorsports activities in one general location as opposed to decentralized facilities for a specific motorsport activity
4. Identify and rank the most promising and acceptable locations in Lancaster County for motorsports facilities and/or activities
5. Evaluate and make recommendations on the most appropriate business model for providing new facilities for participants and spectators, e.g., public, private, public/private partnership.

The Task Force was directed by the Lancaster County Board to complete its work and submit a final report to the Board by March 1, 2007.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Regular Members

Russ Bayer, Chair
Carol Brown
Dave Dykmann
Randy Harre
Gary Juilfs
Chris Kingery
Karen Kurbis
Larry Lewis
Greg Osborn
Stan Patzel
Michael Tavlin

Ex-Officio Members

Mike DeKalb, Planning Department
Kerry Eagan, County Chief Administrative Officer
Scott Holmes, Environmental Division
Manager, Health Department
Jeff Maul, Executive Director,
Convention and Visitors Bureau
Darl Naumann, Lincoln-Lancaster County
Economic Development Coordinator

TASK FORCE PROCESS

As a preliminary matter, the Task Force discussed a definition of "motorsports". Although motorsports can be broadly defined as any motor vehicle used competitively or by a hobbyist, the charge to the Task Force is focused on motorsports facilities. Thus a more appropriate definition of motorsports for purposes of the Task Force would involve racing of motor vehicles on circle tracks, drag racing strips, and road courses. Throughout discussions it was emphasized the Task Force report and recommendations will not be limited to a drag racing facility.

Given the broad scope of the Task Force charge and the limited time to complete the final report and recommendations, the Task Force identified and prioritized the most important issues for discussion. Three subcommittees were formed to focus attention on the following areas of concern:

- Economic, fiscal, social and environmental impacts
- Location
- Demand

The subcommittees met separately and reported back to the entire Task Force. Each subcommittee also produced a written report, copies of which are included with this report.

Additionally, the Task Force heard the following presentations from individuals with expertise in noise, economic development, and development and operation of motor sports facilities:

- Findings of previous motorsports committee - Dr. Darl Naumann, Economic Development Coordinator
- Motorsports facility overview - Rob Wolters, Brainard International Raceway; and Dave Holtgrave, architect with the firm of Holtgrave & Associates, P.C.
- Environmental Impact Considerations: Sound, noise, and drag racing- Dr. Dominique J. Chéenne, Ph.D., Director of Acoustics, Audio, Arts and Acoustics Department, Columbia College, Chicago
- Economic Impact Analysis: The Potential Impact of an NHRA Drag Racing Facility in Lancaster County - Dr. Eric Thompson, Director, UNL Department of Economics, Bureau of Business Research

FINDINGS

Based on the subcommittee reports, special presentations, general Task Force discussions, and other information, the Motorsports Task Force has determined the following key points must be considered in formulating recommendations to the County Board:

Location

- Approximately 280 acres is required for a facility that can accommodate an oval track, road course, and drag strip
 - A stand alone drag strip requires approximately 160 acres
- The most important criteria in locating a facility include:

- Close access to a major paved road, preferably along I-80
- Locate near existing noise sources to mask track noise
- Low impact on residential areas
- Potential sites exist in Lancaster County, including sites near Lincoln, which meet the location criteria for a facility

Economic Impact

- A motorsports facility, whether stand alone or multi-use, have the potential to produce a significant economic impact.
 - Thompson study estimated an annual impact in Lancaster County of \$9.9 million in tourism spending
 - Additional secondary economic impacts also probable
 - Public funding for development and operation of a facility creates a negative economic impact
- Additional information is needed to determine the effect of a motorsports facility on surrounding property valuations.

Environmental and Social Impacts

- Noise (unwanted sound) from a motorsports facility poses a serious problem for compatibility with surrounding land uses.
 - Noise testing should be done for any proposed location under atmospheric conditions most favorable for sound propagation (temperature inversion, humidity, etc.)
 - Existing environmental noises can help dampen the negative effects of motorsports noise
 - Noise standards need to be established, with the authority to waive the standards for certain events
- Additional study needs to be conducted to help measure other potential environmental and social impacts.

Demand

- Nationally there is a high demand from both participants and spectators for motorsports.
- Participation at public hearings and correspondence to the County Board indicate a strong local interest in motorsports
- A well-designed survey with adequate controls can help measure the demand for motorsports facilities in Lancaster County.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the foregoing discussion, the Motorsports Task Force hereby tenders the following recommendations to the Lancaster County Board:

1. Lancaster County and the City of Lincoln should work together to maximize the opportunity for the development of a motorsports facility.
2. Noise standards. (To be developed)
3. Economic development can be maximized through private development and operation of a motorsports facility
 - a. Careful consideration should be given to the amount of public funding which may be required to support a motorsports facility at a specific location

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Motorsports Task Force this ____ day of _____, 2007.

Russ Bayer, Chair

DRAFT

The chart starts with 100db at the starting line and finishing line. Typically, this would be at the high end of most sportsman race cars, and higher sound levels than the majority of drag race cars that would compete at weekly events.

The blue area would be about 76db.

The orange area would be at a level of 70 db or less.

The Yellow area would be at a level of 64 db or less.

There are only two houses that fall in the yellow area, and they are across Highway 77 to the south east. The highway already has truck traffic that can generate over 80 to 90 decibels. The highway will often average higher sound levels than the area in orange at normal traffic levels.

The cart assumes no sound controlling features are employed at the track for easy comparison. If you draw a 5/8 mile radius around a sound source of 100 db you will have an approximate 64 db range. I believe my rules of thumb also are in basic agreement with the information presented by Dr. Chenne.

If you add dirt berms along the track, you can subtract each zone by 10 to 15 db.

Add a wall to the top of the berm, or buildings and you can subtract another 10 to 15 db.

The concrete guard rail will probably help with another few db reduction.

If one assumes that even 15 db can be reduced by various means, then the sportsman cars will not register above 61 db at the edge of the property.


Pro Cars and Top Sportsman cars will run in the 120 db range at times. That would still only be at 81 db at the property line. If additional sound reduction means are employed, the sound level at the property edge can be below 75 db even with pro cars. Fuel cars are another matter and their rarity deserves exemption.

With a pit full of vehicles, people and activities, it will also help reduce sound travel from the racing surface. Vegetation can help. Basically any obstacles that block or absorb sound waves helps.

If the 75 db used in commercial zones is applied, and exemptions are made for special events, then any racing activities can be handled at the facility.

The hills to the east and west will cut another 10 to 15 db from the sound levels. No one outside of a mile would be realistically impacted by sound level.

You can take the same basic contour and overlay it to other potential sites. If you are looking at an oval track or a road course, then draw a 5/8 mile zone around the racing surface to get the 64 db zone around the track.




InterLine

lincoln.ne.gov

lancaster.ne.gov

EXHIBIT

C



InterLinc

Online Survey



This page is for testing and reviewing purposes only. It will function properly but data you supply will not be used and is test data only.

Survey: Lancaster County Motorsports Initiative

Lancaster County plans to examine the viability of Motorsports activities, and the role government should play in facilitating various Motorsports venues. As we analyze and review the possibilities, we think it is important to know how Lancaster County citizens feel about the topic. Questions one and two are optional and will only be used for statistical purposes.

Number**Question**

1. Please identify your gender (optional):

☐ Male ☐ Female

2. Zip code (optional):

3. Age:

☐ Under 13

☐ 13 - 19

☐ 20 - 29

☐ 30 - 39

☐ 40 - 49

☐ 50 - 59

☐ 60 and over

4. Assuming a venue could be identified and developed for the Summer of 2007, what type of Motorsports events would you attend as a SPECTATOR in Lancaster County and estimate how many times would you attend throughout the year? Please enter a number below the event type.

Drag Racing:

Kart Racing:

Sprints / Dirt Oval Track:

Motocross:

Demolition Derby:

Road Course:

5. What type of Motorsports events would you participate in as a DRIVER or CREW MEMBER in Lancaster County and estimate how many times you would participate throughout the year? Please enter a number below the event type.

Drag Racing:

Kart Racing:

Sprints / Dirt Oval Track:

Motocross:

Demolition Derby:

Road Course:

Next


Save Now

1 - 5 of 16 * Required answers.

InterLine

lincoln.ne.gov

lancaster.ne.gov



InterLinc

Online Survey



This page is for testing and reviewing purposes only. It will function properly but data you supply will not be used and is test data only.

Survey: Lancaster County Motorsports Initiative

Lancaster County plans to examine the viability of Motorsports activities, and the role government should play in facilitating various Motorsports venues. As we analyze and review the possibilities, we think it is important to know how Lancaster County citizens feel about the topic. Questions one and two are optional and will only be used for statistical purposes.

| Number | Question |
|--------|----------|
|--------|----------|

6. Are there other Motorsport activities that you would attend?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please identify:

(0 / 1024 Max Char.)

7. Are there other non-Motorsports events that should be available, such as BMX?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please identify:

(0 / 1024 Max Char.)

8. How many Motorsports events outside of Lancaster County did you attend in 2006?

☐ 0

☐ 1 - 2

☐ 3 - 5

☐ 5 - 10

☒ Over 10

9. Do you, or have you, attended or participated in events at:

☐ Scribner

☐ Kearney

☐ Topeka

☐ Other

☐ None

If 'other' please specify:

(0 / 1024 Max Char.)


10. How many people, including yourself, typically accompanied you to the venue?

[Previous](#)

[Next](#)

[Save Now](#)

3 - 10 of 16 * Required answers.



InterLine

Online Survey



This page is for testing and reviewing purposes only. It will function properly but data you supply will not be used and is test data only.

Survey: Lancaster County Motorsports Initiative

Lancaster County plans to examine the viability of Motorsports activities, and the role government should play in facilitating various Motorsports venues. As we analyze and review the possibilities, we think it is important to know how Lancaster County citizens feel about the topic. Questions one and two are optional and will only be used for statistical purposes.

Number**Question**

11. If you are an active participant in Motorsport activities, please check all that apply?

- ☐ Motorcross
- ☐ Drag Racing
- ☐ Road Course
- ☐ Go-Kart / Shifter-Kart Courses
- ☐ Other
- ☐ None of the above

If 'other', please specify:

(0 / 1024 Max Char.)

12. Do you feel that investing in a Motorsports facility is an appropriate use of tax dollars?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Only under certain circumstances and guarantees

13. Would you be willing to invest your own personal funds in a Motorsports facility.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

- ☐ Only under certain circumstances and guarantees

14. What would you consider "too close" to a residential home if a Motorsports facility were to be located in your area?

- ☐ 1/4 mile
☐ 1/2 mile
☐ 1 mile
☐ 3 miles
☐ Over 10 miles
☐ Not concerned with proximity to residential homes

15. Please add any additional comments regarding Motorsport activities in Lancaster County?


(0 / 1024 Max Char.)

Previous

Next

Save Now

11 - 15 of 16 * Required answers.



InterLinc

Online Survey



This page is for testing and reviewing purposes only. It will function properly but data you supply will not be used and is test data only.

Survey: Lancaster County Motorsports Initiative

Lancaster County plans to examine the viability of Motorsports activities, and the role government should play in facilitating various Motorsports venues. As we analyze and review the possibilities, we think it is important to know how Lancaster County citizens feel about the topic. Questions one and two are optional and will only be used for statistical purposes.

Number

Question

16. In case we have follow-up questions and for quality control purposes please include your e-mail address:

(0 / 1024 Max Char.)

[Previous](#)[Save Now](#)

16 of 16 * Required answers.

